REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Status of Claims

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1-18 were pending with claims 1, 8, 13, 14, and 15 being independent.

II. Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 15 and 16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of co-pending Application No. 10/658,208.

With regard to the Examiner's double patenting rejection, Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner to hold these rejections in abeyance until all other patentability issues have been resolved. Should a double patenting rejection remain at that time, Applicants expect to file a Terminal Disclaimer(s) as necessary.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 and 2

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jang (UK Patent No. 2 347 588 – hereinafter Jang) in view of Yamaguchi (U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0206518 – hereinafter Yamaguchi) and further in view of Kida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,728 – hereinafter Kida), in view of Hassell et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0107439 – hereinafter Hassell) and further in view of Kwon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,057,621 – hereinafter Kwon). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, a format scaler for *scaling a size of said video data to a predetermined frame size* *on the basis of said synchronous signals from said decoder* (for decoding the television signal).

This scaling feature is, in fact, illustrated in Fig. 3 of the present application. In more detail, as exemplified in Fig. 3, the format scaler 113 receives 18-bit digital

video data (from ADC 111) as well as synchronous signals (TV_HSYNC and TV_VSYNC signals from decoder 60 as shown in Fig. 2), and performs the scaling operation on the received video data on the basis of received synchronous signals.

In the Office Action, the Examiner cites Kwon as allegedly teaching the above-noted scaling feature. In particular, the Examiner points to the vertical expansion unit 28, as illustrated in Fig. 2 and described in col. 5, lines 37-58 of Kwon, alleging that the vertical expansion unit 28 discloses the above-noted scaling feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Specifically, it is clear that the vertical expansion unit 28 does not receive any synchronous signals (much less synchronous signals from a decoder for decoding a television signal) as input. To be more specific, the only input that the vertical expansion unit 28 receives is the image data D0-D15 outputted from shadow memory 26.

That is, in contrast to the format scaler 113 as exemplified in Fig. 3 of the present application, the vertical expansion unit 28 receives no synchronous signals for its scaling (expanding) operation. As such, the vertical expansion unit 28 simply does not perform the scaling on the basis of received synchronous signals.

Accordingly, contrary to the Examiner's assessment, the vertical expansion unit 28 does not teach or suggest a format scaler for *scaling a size of said video data to a predetermined frame size on the basis of said synchronous signals from said decoder*, as recited in claim 1.

On the other hand, the other cited references, namely Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, and Hassell, do not cure the above-noted deficiency of Kwon with respect to the above-noted scaling feature. Accordingly, claim 1 should be allowable over Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, and Hassell. The rejection of claim 1 should therefore be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

Claims 3-18

Claims 8, 9, 13, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jang, in view of Yamaguchi, in view of Kida, in view of Hassel, in view of Kwon, and further in view of Kim (KR 2001-059645 – hereinafter Kim). Further, claims 3, 5, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jang, in view of Yamaguchi, in view of Kida, in view of Hassell, in view of Kwon, and further in view of Barile (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0093531 – hereinafter Barile). Still further, claims 10, 11, 12, 14, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jang, in view of Yamaguchi, in view of Kida, in view of Hassell, in view of Kwon, in view of Kim, and further in view of Barile. Still further, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Hassell, Kwon and Barile, and further in view of Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,681,285 – hereinafter Ng). Still further, claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Hassell, Kwon and Kim, and further in view of Yui (U.S. Patent No. 6,885,406 – hereinafter Yui).

Claims 8, 13, 14 and 15 contain subject matter related to that of claim 1, particularly with respect to the above-noted scaling feature. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons stated above in connection with claim 1, claims 8, 13, 14 and 15 should also be distinguishable over Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Hassell and Kwon. On the other hand, the cited secondary references Kim and Barile do not cure the above-noted deficiency of Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Hassell and Kwon. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 8, 13, 14 and 15 should be withdrawn.

The rejections of claims 3-7, 9-12, and 16-18 should be withdrawn at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 8, 13, 14 and 15 respectively and the fact that

the cited secondary references Ng and Yui do not cure the above-noted deficiency of Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Hassell, Kwon, Kim and Barile.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Should **any/additional** fees be required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 18-2220.

Respectfully submitted,

Jundong Ma
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 61,789

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: February 4, 2010